

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search. By this amendment, Claims 111, 117, 118, 119 have been amended. Claims 1-110 were previously cancelled. Hence, Claims 111-119 are pending in the Application. It is respectfully submitted that the amended claims do not add any new matter to this Application. Furthermore, the amended claims added herein are for the purpose of promoting readability and clarity.

SUMMARY OF REJECTIONS/OBJECTIONS

Claims 111, 112, 114, 116-119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alam in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,745,368 by Boucher et al.

Claim 113 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alam in view of Boucher et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,353,817 by Jacobs et al.

Claim 115 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alam in view of Boucher et al. and further in view of Lickiss et al.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

CLAIMS 111, 117, 118, and 119

Claim 111, recites in part, the features:

“automatically identifying multi-media type primitive components in each of said plurality of input multi-media files;
automatically decomposing each of said multi-media type primitive components into sub-components;

automatically converting each of said sub-components into corresponding intermediate format components;
integrating said intermediate format components into a single output presentation file corresponding to each target format of said plurality of target formats; and
adjusting said output presentation file to fit bandwidth requirements of each selected output device”

Claim 111 includes the limitation of “automatically identifying multi-media type primitive components in each of said plurality of input multi-media files” followed by “automatically decomposing each of said multi-media type primitive components into sub-components .” *Alam* does not disclose or suggest any decomposition of the multi-media files for later reconversion into a desired format.

The Office action states even though *Alam* does not teach decomposition, “*Boucher* teaches [that] multimedia includes audio type, video type and retrieving any multimedia elements.” It is respectfully submitted that *Boucher* does not teach decomposition of primitives into sub-components. To explain, *Boucher* merely retrieves whatever multimedia elements that are already in existence. *Boucher* does not teach the identification of primitives nor does it teach the further decomposition of those primitives into sub-components. Column 15, lines 40-45 of *Boucher* teaches mere retrieval of elements from a cache or from the Internet for the purpose of rendering into a displayable format.

Further, neither *Alam* nor *Boucher* disclose adjusting the output file to fit bandwidth requirements of each selected output device. Further, Claim 111 integrates the multi-media type primitive components from several multi-media files into a single

output file. In contrast, *Alam* merely discloses converting a single text or bitmapped input file.

It is respectfully submitted that Claim 111 is allowable because neither *Alam* nor Boucher, either alone or in combination, anticipate or make obvious the limitations of claim 111.

Claims 117, 118 and 119 contain limitations that re similar to Claim 111. Thus, Claims 117, 118 and 119 are allowable for at least the reasons proffered herein in respect to Claim 111.

CLAIMS 112-116

Claims 112-116 are directly dependent upon Claim 111 and include all the limitations of Claim 111 and therefore are allowable for at least the reasons provided herein in respect to Claim 111.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 112-116 recite additional features that independently render Claims 112-116 patentable over the art of record. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 112-116 be held in condition for allowance.


CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

If in the opinion of the Examiner a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (650) 838-4311.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due to Applicants' Deposit Account No. 50-2207.

Respectfully submitted,
Perkins Coie LLP



Carina M. Tan
Registration No. 45,769

Date: October 18, 2004

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 22918
Perkins Coie LLP
P. O. Box 2168
Menlo Park, California 94026
(650) 838-4300